DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 622 SP 001 839

By- Shawver, David
Professional Education or Apprenticeship?
Pub Date Nov 68
Note- 5p.
Journal Cit- The Teachers College Record; v70 n2 p127-131 Nov 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.35
Descriptors- *Apprenticeships, *Clinical Experience, Field Experience Programs, Internship Programs, Practicums, *Preservice Education, *Professional Education, Student Teaching, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teaching Skills

Two recent trends in teacher education are designed to improve the practical skills of the teacher. One is the internship, the other is the provision of college level activities (such as microteaching) that require competency in particular classroom skills. Both provide valuable and necessary experiences; however, these experiences count for nothing if not accompanied by adequate supervision and analysis. Moreover, there is a danger that overemphasis on practical experience activities will push instruction in professional education out of the teacher education curriculum. "If an attempt is made to hold on to the specialized courses, while at the same time utilizing more laboratory situations, the time will simply not be available for the type of analysis necessary." In conclusion, adequate personnel, time, and money are prerequisites to effective internship programs. (SG)

EDO 24622

Professional Education or Apprenticeship?

David Shawver
Washington State University

Currently, teacher education is undergoing widespread scrutiny from both within and from without the professonal fraternity. Probing criticism of public elementary and secondary education of a few years ago is being logically followed by questions concerning how we educate teachers.

Professional associations, state boards of education, and (most notably), teacher educators themselves are suggesting possible changes in our traditional patterns of educating teachers. Two recent trends will be the focus of this appraisal. One is the concept of greatly enlarging the initial supervised experiences of students in teaching before giving them a standard (or permanent) teaching certificate. This is taking the form of some type of internship for beginning teachers before they are accorded full-fledged professional status. A second emphasis is that of providing activities at the college level that concentrate to a greater extent than formerly upon the student acquiring competency in specific classroom skills. Micro-teaching (either with or without the use of video-taping) is an example of this trend. The goal of both of these new trends is to improve the practical skills of the teacher before giving him a free rein in the classroom.

What are the theoretical advantages of these two procedures in teacher education? What are some possible limitations? First, a statement from TEPS (National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards) on internship:

> An internship, jointly planned and supervised by the school and colleges, should follow the regular five-year pre-service program of teacher education which includes student teaching.[1]

The reasons for recommending an internship are rooted in our customary supervisory practices of, or rather our *lack* of supervision of new teachers. The new teacher's induction into teaching has too often been a period of "trial

Professor Shawver, concerned about ways of inducting new teachers into their profession, presents an argument for the concept of internship. It is not enough to provide practical experience, he says; there is insufficient critical analysis of student teacher behavior in the classroom. What is needed is a combination of theoretical education with functional internship programs in schools committed to providing educative supervision.

1 TEPS, *A Position Paper*, 1963, pg. 14.

November 1968, Vol. 70, No. 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Teachers College Record

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP001839

by fire" or, if you prefer, a "sink or swim" proposition. Once the individual had his initial teaching certificate, he was supposed to function in very nearly the same capacity in the school as the veteran teacher. In fact, many times the new teacher was asked to do even more than the experienced teacher since the older teachers had "seniority" when the choice and not-so-choice jobs were handed out by the administration.

Faced with the extremely complex job that teaching is, and given little supervisory help or in-service training, it was little wonder that many neophyte teachers floundered. Some left teaching entirely, while others retreated into a careful, uncreative routine and concentrated mainly on avoiding criticism from administrative personnel.

The Values of Internship It became obvious that if teachers were to grow, they needed time and help to develop their skills and knowledge on the job. They could not be expected to be full-fledged teachers the moment they left the undergraduate campus. They needed gradual induction into the profession and a lightened load to give them time to study and prepare. They needed supervisory personnel who could help them plan and evaluate their teaching.

The internship concept made excellent sense. No theoretical study of teaching can substitute for actual teaching experience. Most new teachers have had student teaching, but most teacher educators feel that the student teaching experience is neither sufficiently long nor sufficiently "real."

In addition to a growing interest in internship, there is an increased emphasis on teaching specific behaviors to fit specific teaching activities. Here again, there is a shift from reliance upon the student's general theoretical understanding to an insistence that the student learn in considerable detail specific skills of instruction. A frequent criticism of programs of teacher education has been aimed at the "general" approach. Instead of a student learning a specific teaching performance, the criticism goes, education courses often are broad generalized studies of educational concepts that really don't "show us what to do." What they need, complain many teachers, is more "practical" or "how-to-do-it" kinds of activities. A growing number of teacher educators agree with this criticism. To overcome such weaknesses in teacher education, they wish to analyze teaching, decide just what its component parts are, and then make an effort to give college students experience in practicing these specific parts of the teaching act.

Supervision and Analysis Educators continually stress the need, however, for more direct teaching experiences which are

carefully supervised and *analyzed*. It is in the areas of supervision and analysis that teacher education has often stumbled before. To provide increasing practical experience for the prospective teacher is one thing—to provide this in a way in which it will be most functional in the teacher education program demands an added dimension. One of the difficulties with the direct experience of teaching which we now offer via student teaching is that there is not enough skilled and critical analysis of the student teacher's behavior in the setting. In regard to this, Moore states, "My assessment of the situation, . . . , is that most institutions still have apprenticeship arrangements, not student teaching."[2]

This is a key thought: our current emphasis on enlarging the laboratory experiences of teachers will only be fruitful if we are just as concerned with the analysis of the experiences as we are in providing the experiences. We must help the new teacher to be able to generalize from his experiences and become a "theoretician" even as we provide him with practice on skills. "Practice makes perfect" has never been a sound admonition. Practice can be miseducative for the teacher if it does not allow for time and help in seeing a specific practical skill in relation to the total problem of educating the child. We must never fall into the trap of even hinting, by the way we develop our teacher education programs, that the primary way to become a good teacher is to observe a good teacher and copy him.

John Dewey clearly saw the danger of providing apprenticeship training for teachers rather than professional education. A review of his thinking on the subject should be a must for anyone who is considering making teacher education more "practical" by liberal infusions of more first-hand experience. After a soundly reasoned argument, Dewey comes to the conclusion that: ". . . practical work should be pursued primarily with reference to its reaction upon the professional pupil in making him a thoughtful and alert student of education, rather than to help him get immediate proficiency."[3] The closing sentence of his article reads: "The thing needful is improvement of education, not simply by turning out teachers who can do better the things that are now necessary to do, but rather by changing the conception of what constitutes education."[4]

2 Hollis A. Moore, Jr., "Keynote Address, *Remaking the World of the Career Teacher*," National Commission on Teacher Education & Professional Standard, NEA, Washington, D.C., 1966, pg. 27.

3 John Dewey, "The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers," *Third Yearbook, Part I*, National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1904, pp. 9-30.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Overemphasis on Techniques Burton makes pertinent comments in relation to over-emphasizing specific techniques:

> The effort to prepare teachers by giving them mastery of devices, "how to's," or techniques is futile; it is detrimental to both teacher and teaching. The operator of devices usually can *manage* a classroom rather well but, paradoxically, in many cases does not stimulate learning. A teacher fundamentally ignorant of moral values, who has never developed any values or appreciations of his own, cannot stimulate the growth of character no matter what devices he has been given. To give devices for the development of "citizenship" to a teacher ignorant of the structure and process of democratic society is absurd. Devices will not improve the questioning technique of a teacher ignorant of the aim of education and of the process of learning.[5]

The immediate reaction of some educators to admonitions to avoid apprenticeship and "how-to-do-it" programs is likely to be a strong denial that their ideas on internships, micro-teaching, simulated teaching, etc., actually lead in this direction. Much to the contrary, is likely to be their reaction; such procedures emphasize intellectual criticism rather than blind acceptance of behavioral patterns.

While this is no doubt true, the university or college and public school settings in which teacher education programs exist may tend to militate against the fulfillment of the promises of the new emphasis on direct experience for the student. To understand why this is true, we need to bring our discussion to the level of the daily struggles of an education department. Working within a prescribed number of quarter or semester hours allotted to professional education in the total college program of the student, time priorities become very real and pressing problems. How much time is our prospective teacher to spend in simulated teaching activities? How many credit hours is he to receive for such activities? How will college credit be allowed for internships? Obviously, if any type of laboratory experience is to be greatly increased, something else in the student's college program is going to be eliminated. Choices are inevitable, and the choices made should leave us with a student who is broadly educated in educational philosophy and aims, and with a strong theoretical understanding in psychology, as well as one who has considerable proficiency in specific teaching skills. While it is perfectly possible, in theory, to get this breadth and depth as the student analyzes his direct experiences, and thus develop a totally integrated program with no divisions into various subjects, it

5 William H. Burton, *The Guidance of Learning Activities*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962.

remains to be seen how many colleges are willing to scrap their specialized undergraduate courses in education and substitute direct experience and its analysis.

If an attempt is made to hold on to the specialized courses, while at the same time utilizing more laboratory situations, the time will simply not be available for the type of analysis necessary.

Before the internship part of the new envisioned programs can become really educative, public schools will need to make significant commitments in the area of financing such programs. Helpful supervision of the intern will not come about by public schools throwing open the doors to intership programs *before* they get the personnel, time, and money to do the job adequately. If "half-done," internships will deteriorate into a system whereby sub-professionals do a professional's work at part pay. Such an approach would do much to justify the opinion of a sizable number of people, who are already suspicious of teacher education, that teaching does not really require professionally educated people.

There can be no doubt that a new era in teacher education is here. Let us make sure that the mistakes of the past are not repeated, however, and that our new and prospective teachers have the way opened for them to develop into professional educators (yes, even educational "statesmen") as well as skilled technicians.